



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/513,207 | 02/24/2000 | Jian Li | 7468.0002 | 6210 |

22852 7590 01/06/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SODERQUIST, ARLEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/513,207

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Arlen Soderquist

Art Unit

1743

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-12 and 14-24

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ The attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s): _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Arlen Soderquist
ARLEN SODERQUIST
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the new issues include failure of a dependent claim to further limit the claim from which it depends and clarity of the claims. Because of the changes to claims 1 and 11 it is not clear if claims 2 and 12 provide a further limitation since it is not clear what distinguishes an ATR-UV probe from the language added to the end of claims 1 and 11. In claim 11 the language used to incorporate the liquid kraft pulp stream into the claim is acceptable for a method claim, but is not clear as an apparatus limitation. In claims 23-24, there is a question of whether these claims further limit the claims from which they depend since there is no structure to cause dilution of the sample. A functional limitation requires that there be sufficient structure for the function to be performed. Again this limitation is appropriate for a method claim, but does not add further structure to an apparatus claim and would therefore not constitute a further limitation of the apparatus. It is noted that an undiluted sample can be measured by both an apparatus with and without provisions to form a diluted sample. In the former, a control program would allow that to occur, however the instant claims neither exclude structure for forming a diluted sample or include structure to control the apparatus to prevent dilution of the sample.